



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

m-l

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/776,692	02/12/2004	Jao-Ching Lin		4211

7590 03/16/2007
Ann Tsai
Suite 137, PmB 174
931 West 75th Street
Naperville, IL 60565

EXAMINER

SHAPIRO, LEONID

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2629

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/776,692	LIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Leonid Shapiro	2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-76 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 18-23, 38-49, 74-76 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 13-17, 24-37 and 50-73 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claim Objections

1. Claim 58 objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 58 depends on claim 58.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 2-37,39,74-76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is not clear what does it mean: "...any other directions..." in claims 2,39.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2629

3. Claims 1,3-6,38-43,74,76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hinckley et al. (6,972,749 B2).

As to claim 1, Hinckley et al. teaches a method of scrolling window screen by means of controlling electronic device (col. 1, lines 6-9), which at least has a touch device, comprising following steps:

(A)providing "N" press zones, and the "N" being designated as an integer at least 1 (figs 7-8,12, items 730,750, col. 8, lines 42-47); and

(B)Detecting the "N" press zones and controlling the window screen scrolling along a "J" direction once a "J" press zone has been detected being pressed (figs 7-8,12, items 730,750, from col. 7, line 59 to col.8, line 27).

As to claim 38, Hinckley et al. teaches an electronic device, comprising:

at least a screen, displaying at least a window screen (col. 1, lines 6-9);

at least a touch device, providing N press zones, the N being an integer of at least 1 and the press zones can be detected (figs 7-8,12, items 730,750, col. 8, lines 42-47); and

a processing unit, electrically connecting with the screen and the touch device and controlling the window screen scrolling in a J direction in case of the a J press zone in the N press zones being touched (figs 7-8,12, items 730,750, from col. 7, line 59 to col.8, line 27).

As to claims 3-6,39-43 Hinckley et al. teaches "J" in step (A) represents an integer between 1 and N and the direction "J" means a direction upward, downward, leftward, rightward (figs 7-8,12, items 730,750).

As to claim 74 Hinckley et al. teaches wherein N=4 and the touch device is provided with an upward scroll zone, a downward scroll zone, a leftward scroll zone and rightward scroll zone and the processing unit control the window screen to scroll upward or downward in case of the touch device having detected the upward scroll zone or the downward scroll zone being pressed and the processing unit controls the window screen to scroll leftward or rightward in case of the touch device having detected the rightward scroll zone or the leftward scroll zone being pressed (fig. 7, items 730,750, col. 8, lines 42-47).

As to claim 76 Hinckley et al. teaches the processing unit is further loaded with a driver to detect the pressing of the first and second press zone with the touch device (col. 4, lines 30-35).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 7,20-23,44,75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hinckley et al. in view of Allen et al. (5,943,052).

Hinckley et al. teaches scroll bar and when the first press zone is pressed, the window screen is controlled to scroll in the first direction and when the second press

Art Unit: 2629

zone is pressed, the window screen is controlled to scroll in the second direction in step (B) (figs 7-8,12, items 730,750, from col. 7, line 59 to col.8, line 27).

Hinckley et al. does not disclose the window screen at a lateral side thereof is further provided with a scroll bar.

Allen et al. teaches the window screen at a lateral side thereof is further provided with a scroll bar (fig. 2, item s 15-16,30, col. 2, lines 46-62).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate teachings of Allen et al. into Hinckley et al. system in order to use graphical user interface (col. 1, lines 6-9 in the Allen et al. reference).

As to claims 20-23 Hinckley et al. teaches the window screen keeps scrolling in case of the first press zone or the second zone having been detected being pressed (col. 8, lines 3-27).

As to claim 75 Hinckley et al. teaches the processing unit is loaded with an operation system and application program to form a graphic interface of user with scroll bar (fig. 2, item s 15-16,30, col. 2, lines 46-62).

5. Claims 8-12,18-19,45-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hinckley et al. in view of Anderson (6,424,338 B1).

As to claims 8-12,45-49 Hinckley et al. teaches first and second press zones in step (A) (figs 7-8,12, items 730,750, col. 8, lines 42-47)

Hinckley et al. does not disclose a plurality of speed zones respectively and each of the speed zones is provided with different scrolling speeds.

Anderson teaches a plurality of speed zones respectively and each of the speed zones is provided with different scrolling speeds (figs. 2-3, items 32,34,36, from col. 9, line 64 to col. 10, line 17).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate teachings of Anderson into Hinckley et al. system in order to improve operational features (col. 1, lines 4-9 in the Anderson reference).

As to claim 18-19, Anderson teaches position and the pressed position nearer the center of the touch device provides slower scrolling speeds and the pressed position is farther from the center of the touch device provides faster scrolling speeds in step (B) (figs. 2-3, items 32,34,36, col. 10, lines 41-62).

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 13-17,24-37,50-73 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Relative to claim 13,50 the major difference between the teaching of the prior art of record (Hinckley et al., Anderson and Allen et al.) and the instant invention is that the scrolling speed of the window screen can be regulated based on number of times and

Art Unit: 2629

duration of the pressing in case of the first press zone or second press zone having been detected being pressed more than once in step (B).

Claims 14-17 and 51-60 depend on claims 13,50.

Relative to claim 24,61 the major difference between the teaching of the prior art of record (Hinckley et al., Anderson and Allen et al.) and the instant invention is that special press zone is provided on the touch device and the scroll bar can be reset in case of the special press zone having been detected being in a state of being pressed.

Relative to claim 25,62 the major difference between the teaching of the prior art of record (Hinckley et al., Anderson and Allen et al.) and the instant invention is that the scroll bar can be reset in case of a plurality of press zones having been detected being pressed at the same time.

Claims 26-37,63-73 depend on claims 24-25,61-62.

Telephone InquireAny inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leonid Shapiro whose telephone number is 571-272-7683. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 a.m. to 5 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe can be reached on 571-272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2629

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LS
03.15.07



RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600